

**WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Tuesday, July 23, 2002**

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review meeting was held on Tuesday, July 23, 2002, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence. Also present were Zoning Administrator Murphy and Zoning Officer Beck.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Brendel motioned to approve the consent agenda minus **ARB #74-02** which was removed for further discussion.

ARB #73-02 Edwards & Lyon/800 South Henry Street – Exterior Change (remove chimney and replace roof with new metal roof) – Approved.

ARB #75-02 Bruton Parish Church Rectory/314 Prince George Street – Fence and multi-use playground equipment – Approved.

ARB #76-02 Williamsburg United Methodist Church/500 Jamestown Road – Handicap Ramp – Approved.

ARB #78-02 Granger/302 Harrison Avenue – Exterior Change (new brick siding, shingles & windows) – Approved.

ARB #67-02 Driscoll/4 Bayberry Lane – Fence – Approved.

ARB #77-02 Shultz/2 Saint Simone Court – Exterior change (enclose existing screen porch into sunroom) – Approved.

ARB

SIGN #29-02 Holly Hills Carriage Homes/201 Brookwood Drive – Monument Sign – Approved.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Sandbeck and Mr. Spence.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT

ARB #69-02 Condor Properties at Williamsburg/Brandywyne Subdivision – Exterior Change (eliminate exterior muntins requirement for windows)

The Chairman noted that the applicant Paula Hertzberg provided a written request to withdraw her application which was accepted by the Board.

ARB #70-02 Cyphers/624 South Henry Street – Exterior Change (vinyl siding, shutters & retroactive approval for vinyl windows)

Robert Cyphers, owner, proposed the installation of vinyl siding and shutters and requested retroactive approval for vinyl windows. Mr. Cyphers stated he was trying to improve the house. He noted that the house was accessed at \$16,000, and he did not want to put a lot of money into the improvements because it was not worth it.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Cyphers to explain why vinyl windows were installed without Board approval when he was notified that approval from the Board was required and was in fact given a copy of the ***Design Review Guidelines*** before the windows were installed. Mr. Cyphers stated that he hired a contractor to perform the work and that the contractor should have obtained all approvals necessary to perform the work including Architectural Review Board approval. Mr. Cyphers again noted that the house was not worth much in value and he would rather demolish the house before sinking a lot of money into the property.

Mr. Spence reminded Mr. Cyphers that approval from the Architectural Review Board was required before the building could be demolished.

A general discussion followed with the Board noting the following from the ***Design Review Guidelines***:

- Vinyl siding is not an acceptable material for exterior walls in **Zone One** of the **Architectural Preservation District**.
- Vinyl shutters are not appropriate in **Zone One** of the **Architectural Preservation District**.
- The vinyl replacement windows with muntins between the panes of glass are not appropriate for a building on the City's Listing of Locally Significant Architecture and within **Zone One** of the **Architectural Preservation District**.
- The historic character of the property should be retained.

Mr. Walker noted for the record that Architectural Review Board's packet contained a letter from the Zoning Officer that was sent to Mr. Cyphers indicating vinyl windows would need approval from the Architectural Review Board before installation. Mr. Cyphers stated that he thought it was only the vinyl siding that needed approval from the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Walker motioned to deny ARB #70-02 covering vinyl siding, vinyl shutters and vinyl windows because the applicant's request is not in accordance with the City's **Design Review Guidelines** and those recommended by the Secretary of Interior for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings for the following reasons:

- Vinyl siding is not an acceptable material for exterior walls in **Zone One** of the **Architectural Preservation District**.
- Vinyl shutters are not appropriate in **Zone One** of the **Architectural Preservation District**.
- The vinyl replacement windows with muntins between the panes of glass are not appropriate for a building on the City's Listing of Locally Significant Architecture and within **Zone One** of the **Architectural Preservation District**.
- The historic character of the property should be retained.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

ARB #71-02 South Henry Street Condo Association/514-516 South Henry Street – Exterior Change (replace brick chimneys with vinyl looking brick)

James Meade, President of the South Henry Street Condo Association, was present to discuss the proposed change to the chimneys at the South Henry Street Condos. Mr. Meade explained to the Board that the brick façade on the chimneys had deteriorated to a point where pieces of brick were falling into the parking lot. In order to correct the condition, the Condo Association had contracted to have the brick façade replaced with a Nailite Polymer Panels (vinyl brick). Mr. Meade noted that one chimney had been replaced with Nailite and he agreed with staff's comment that the Nailite color used on the chimney does not match the existing color of brick on the building.

Mr. Williams asked what was supporting the brick façade? Mr. Meade stated that he was not sure and that he would be happy to bring someone to the next meeting to discuss the proposal in more detail. Mr. Williams noted that if wood trusses from the roof were the only support it could cause the brick façade to fail because the support would not be adequate for the weight of the brick. Mr. Spence added that a combination of heat and moisture getting between the façade and the frame could cause the façade to rack and warp.

A discussion followed and the Board agreed that the material proposed did not meet the **Design Review Guidelines** and the brick used on the chimneys should closely match the existing brick color on the building. Mr. Meade asked if the

Nailite material was acceptable if the color matched the existing brick. The Board noted that they would not make a final decision on brick or type of material that would be allowed on the chimneys without knowing what type of support existed on the chimneys. Mr. Meade requested to table the request until the next meeting in order to investigate what type of support the chimneys had and alternative materials for the chimneys.

Mr. Brendel motioned to table ARB #71-02 to allow the applicant time to investigate other alternatives as discussed at the meeting for the chimneys.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

ARB #72-02 Carson/308 Griffin Avenue – Addition to single-family dwelling

Cary Carson, owner, presented his request including the list of materials and colors proposed for the addition.

Mr. Williams noted that on the front elevation over the front door that three types of siding were proposed and asked Mr. Carson if the number could be reduced to two types of siding thereby meeting the ***Design Review Guidelines***. Mr. Carson agreed to remove the plywood siding and replace it with cement siding to match the other cement siding on the front elevation.

Mr. Williams asked if the proposed medium gray standing seamed metal roof had a matte finished or a shine to it? Mr. Carson stated the proposed metal roof would not have a shine to it.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB# 72-02 conditioned upon the following:

- That the plywood on the front elevation be the same finish as the dormer to reduce the number of materials used on the front elevation from three to two.
- That the final choice of colors proposed for dwelling be reviewed and approved by staff.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Walker, and Mr. Spence.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: Mr. Sandbeck.

ARB #74-02 Reese/100 Richmond Hill Court – New single-family dwelling

This application was tabled because no representative was present to discuss the request. Mr. Freiling asked for this application to be removed from the consent agenda because he was concerned with the overwhelming cycloid windows located on the front and back elevations that would be visible from South Henry Street.

SIGNS

ARB

SIGN #31-02 Jackson Hewitt Tax Service/1507-A Richmond Road – Building sign & face change in shared freestanding sign

Gurwant Rekhi was present to discuss her sign proposal. Ms. Rekhi presented the colors and materials proposed for the building mounted sign and the replacement face on the freestanding sign.

The Board expressed concern with the proposed building mounted sign because the colors and materials proposed did not match other signs in the complex and that the **Design Review Guidelines** required uniformity with signs throughout the site.

A general discussion followed with the Board agreeing that the signs on the building must be consistent and suggested that the applicant design a sign that matches the existing signs on the building which are constructed of wood with a tan background with a dark brown border and lettering. The Board was concerned with the red starburst on the freestanding sign and suggested that the applicant make the starburst black to match the lettering because the other signs have a white background with black lettering and that the red color proposed was not an approved color on the City's color palettes.

Mr. Williams motioned to deny ARB Sign #31-02 because the **Design Review Guidelines** requires materials, colors, and lettering to be uniform throughout the site and compatible with the related building. The Board noted that a sign on the building matching the colors and materials existing for the other business on the building would be acceptable. It further noted that the freestanding sign would be acceptable if the red starburst is changed to black to match the black lettering and white background of the existing sign.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Walker, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

Minutes of July 9, 2002 meeting.

The minutes were approved as presented.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Jason Beck
Zoning Officer